

# MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

on occasions when Held in Washington, D.C., February 18, 1948. they could

have overruled us would have been by abolishing the Commission.

The fifth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year

The only real issue we ever lost in this City was the controversy over 1948 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Wednesday, the Thomas Jefferson Memorial. That was a Congressional matter and was February 18, 1948. The following members were present:

decided accordingly. But I think the Commission was vindicated by the public

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,

because I still Mr. Finley, the person that likes the Jefferson Memorial. It

Mr. Reinhard,

is a big, clumsy out of place in a location that should have left

Mr. Sterne,

Mr. Murphy,

the vista down Mr. Lawrie, I am sure the people would have much preferred

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and

the peristyle and statue scheme that had the approval of this Commission.

Administrative Officer.

The New York City Art Commission has the veto power, but what does it

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

amount to? In spite of an adverse ruling by that Commission, it is a matter

of 1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Such a

meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on January 14, 1948, were

approved, subject to an amendment suggested by Mr. Sterne that his entire power,

statement, regarding a proposition to cast the Arlington Memorial Bridge design,

Statuary abroad, be made a part of those Minutes. The Commission agreed meeting

to this (Exhibit A). January 14th, he had received a letter from Secretary of

the 2. VETO POWER FOR THE COMMISSION: During a discussion over the Annex on

controversy concerning the erection of a second porch on the South Portico

of the White House, and the recent one concerning the erection of the February

Pan American Annex south of the Interior Department Building, Mr. Lawrie

thought the Commission of Fine Arts should have more power. He felt the work and

Commission did not have the right kind of authority when the head of a of the

Department or other Government agency can write to the Commission for advice,

and then deliberately act contrary to the advice of the Commission. part of these

Chairman Clarke replied: The Commission of Fine Arts has never American

asked for the veto power since its establishment in 1910, and, if it had, Capital



Held in Washington, D.C., February 18, 1948.

The first meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1948 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Wednesday,

February 18, 1948. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,  
Mr. Finley,  
Mr. Reinhard,  
Mr. Sterne,  
Mr. Murphy,  
Mr. Lawrie.

Also H. P. Cassemeyer, Secretary and

Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on January 14, 1948, were approved, subject to an amendment suggested by Mr. Sterne that his entire statement, regarding a proposition to cast the Arlington Memorial Bridge Statuary should, be made a part of those Minutes. The Commission agreed to this (Exhibit A).

2. VETO POWER FOR THE COMMISSION: During a discussion over the controversy concerning the erection of a second porch on the South Portico of the White House, and the recent one concerning the erection of the Pan American Annex south of the Interior Department Building, Mr. Lawrie thought the Commission of Fine Arts should have more power. He felt the Commission did not have the right kind of authority when the head of a Department or other Government agency can write to the Commission for advice, and then deliberately act contrary to the advice of the Commission. Chairman Clarke replied: The Commission of Fine Arts has never asked for the veto power since its establishment in 1910, and, if it had,



on occasions when questions with Congress arose, the only way they could have overruled us would have been by abolishing the Commission.

The only real issue we ever lost in this City was the controversy over the Thomas Jefferson Memorial. That was a Congressional matter and was decided accordingly. But I think the Commission was vindicated by the public because I still have to find the person that likes the Jefferson Memorial. It is a big, clumsy thing and out of place in a location that should have left the vista down the river open. I am sure the people would have much preferred the peristyle and statue scheme that had the approval of this Commission.

The New York City Art Commission has the veto power, but what does it amount to? In spite of an adverse ruling by that Commission, it is a matter of record that chiefs of city offices have gone ahead with projects. Such a thing is worse than having a veto power; it belittles a Commission."

Mr. Finley remarked that if the Commission of Fine Arts had the veto power, he felt it would have been creating so many enemies as to break the Commission.

3. PAN AMERICAN ANNEX: Chairman Clarke reported that, since the meeting of the Commission on January 14th, he had received a letter from Secretary of the Interior Krug, protesting against the erection of the Pan American Annex on the triangle south of the Interior Department building, along Constitution Avenue at Nineteenth Street, and that he had replied by letter dated February 3, 1948, stating that the location had been authorized by Congress in 1929 and had the approval of both this Commission and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Mr. Krug sent a similar letter to the Director of the Pan American Union.

The Commission decided to make the above-mentioned letters a part of these Minutes, as well as a reply to Mr. Krug by the Director of the Pan American Union and a letter from General Grant, written in behalf of the National Capital



on occasions when questions with Congress arose, the only way they could

have overruled us would have been by abolishing the Commission.

The only real issue we ever lost in this City was the controversy over

the Thomas Jefferson Memorial. That was a Congressional matter and was

decided accordingly. But I think the Commission was vindicated by the public

because I still have to find the person that likes the Jefferson Memorial. It

is a big, clumsy thing and out of place in a location that should have left

the vista down the river open. I am sure the people would have much preferred

the peristyle and statue scheme that had the approval of this Commission.

The New York City Art Commission has the veto power, but what does it

amount to? In spite of an adverse ruling by that Commission, it is a matter

of record that chiefs of city offices have gone ahead with projects. Such a

thing is worse than having a veto power; it belittles a Commission."

Mr. Timley remarked that if the Commission of Fine Arts had the veto power,

he felt it would have been creating so many enemies as to break the Commission.

3. PAN AMERICAN ANNEX: Chairman Clarke reported that, since the meeting

of the Commission on January 14th, he had received a letter from Secretary of

the Interior King, protesting against the erection of the Pan American Annex on

the triangle south of the Interior Department building, along Constitution

Avenue at Nineteenth Street, and that he had replied by letter dated February

2, 1948, stating that the location had been authorized by Congress in 1939

and had the approval of both this Commission and the National Capital Park and

Planning Commission. Mr. King sent a similar letter to the Director of the

Pan American Union. Government agency was asked to the Commission for advice.

The Commission decided to make the above-mentioned letters a part of these

Minutes, as well as a reply to Mr. King by the Director of the Pan American

Union and a letter from General Grant, written in behalf of the National Capital



Park and Planning Commission to Mr. Krug on the same subject (Exhibit B).

Chairman Clarke said it was ridiculous at this late date that the Secretary of the Interior should raise any question about the building line on Constitution Avenue, since it had been determined by the Commission of Fine Arts nearly 30 years ago that these marble buildings along this part of Constitution Avenue should form a frame for the Lincoln Memorial. They were to have a somewhat informal setting with space for garden treatment in front of them, the same as the marble buildings along Seventeenth Street nearby.

Chairman Clarke also called attention to a letter that Dr. Moore wrote to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds under date of May 11, 1929, explaining the reasons for placing the Pan American Annex on the triangle mentioned (Exhibit C). The building was designed by Dr. Cret. It is to be a three-story building, 170' x 100' faced with Georgia marble, and will be 100 feet back from the curb along Constitution Avenue. The north side of the building facing the Interior Department has also been given a garden treatment. A contract for erecting the building was made several months ago and they are proceeding with the foundations.

The Secretary stated that he had been informed by Dr. William Manger, Assistant Director of the Pan American Union, that he had heard Mr. Krug wants to persuade Congress to stop the erection of the building and place it in a central location in front of the Interior Department, closing Virginia Avenue between 18th and 19th Streets; but that if building operations are held up the contractor will ask for at least \$300,000 compensatory damages. The cost of the building has been increased from \$650,000, for which it could have been built when Mr. Ickes held up building operations about 1935, to \$2,400,000.

Chairman Clarke added that he had a talk with Capt. H. C. Whitehurst, Director of the District of Columbia Highway Department yesterday, and was



Park and Planning Commission to Mr. King on the same subject (Exhibit B).

Chairman Clarke said it was ridiculous at this late date that the

Secretary of the Interior should raise any question about the building line

on Constitution Avenue, since it had been determined by the Commission of

the Arts nearly 30 years ago that these marble buildings along this part of

Constitution Avenue should form a frame for the Lincoln Memorial. They were

to have a somewhat informal setting with space for garden treatment in front

of them, the same as the marble buildings along Seventeenth Street nearby.

Chairman Clarke also called attention to a letter that Dr. Moore wrote

to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds under

date of May 11, 1939, explaining the reasons for placing the Pan American

Annex on the triangle mentioned (Exhibit C). The building was designed by

Dr. Gret. It is to be a three-story building, 170' x 100' faced with

Georgia marble, and will be 100 feet back from the curb along Constitution

Avenue. The north side of the building facing the Interior Department has

also been given a garden treatment. A contract for erecting the building was

made several months ago and they are proceeding with the foundations.

The Secretary stated that he had been informed by Dr. William Manger,

Assistant Director of the Pan American Union, that he had heard Mr. King wants

to persuade Congress to stop the erection of the building and place it in a

central location in front of the Interior Department, closing Virginia Avenue

between 18th and 19th Streets; but that if building operations are held up

the contractor will ask for at least \$300,000 compensatory damages. The cost

of the building has been increased from \$250,000, for which it could have

been built when Mr. Jones help up building operations about 1935, to \$2,400,000.

Chairman Clarke added that he had a talk with Capt. H. C. Whitehurst,

Director of the District of Columbia Highway Department yesterday, and was



informed that the District Government never would agree to closing this part of Virginia Avenue, as was demonstrated during the ten-year controversy with former Secretary of the Interior Ickes on the subject.

Chairman Clarke said finally that the Pan American Union is going ahead with the building, and that when completed it will be one of the most beautiful buildings in Washington.

4. INSPECTION OF WORLD WAR CEMETERIES IN EUROPE: The Commission granted the request of Chairman Clarke that he be designated to represent the Commission of Fine Arts during an inspection of some of the World War Cemeteries in and nearby France, while on a visit to that country during the month of April, 1948 (Exhibit D).

5. LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR THE SECRETARY: The Commission granted leave of absence to the Secretary to enable him to go to Paris and do certain necessary historical research during the months of July and August, 1948, needed for a biography on the Life of Pierre Charles L'Enfant which he has under way, and which is to be made available during the Sesquicentennial Celebration in 1950.

Chairman Clarke said that Mr. Caemmerer had told him that this is to be a semi-official trip, and that he had been informed by Government officials that many persons travel at Government expense for less worthy purposes, so that, since this is not a pleasure trip, the Government should pay part of the expenses of the trip.

Mr. Caemmerer said he would appreciate favorable action in this matter, since it would help establish a priority in securing passage on a steamboat during the month of July; 83,000 applications have been received by Transatlantic lines for sailings during the period from March to October, 1948, with less than one-fourth the number of steamboats that sailed in pre-war times.

The Commission discussed the subject, and agreed to an allotment of \$335, which is the minimum for a one-way passage, first class.



informed that the District Government never would agree to closing this part of Virginia Avenue, as was demonstrated during the ten-year controversy with former Secretary of the Interior Ickes on the subject.

Chairman Clarke said finally that the Pan American Union is going ahead with the building, and that when completed it will be one of the most beautiful buildings in Washington.

4. INSPECTION OF WORLD WAR COMMEMORATIVES IN EUROPE: The Commission granted the request of Chairman Clarke that he be designated to represent the Commission of Fine Arts during an inspection of some of the World War Comemorative in and nearby France, while on a visit to that country during the month of April, 1948 (Exhibit D).

5. LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR THE SECRETARY: The Commission granted leave of absence to the Secretary to enable him to go to Paris and do certain necessary historical research during the months of July and August, 1948, needed for a biography on the life of Pierre Charles L'Enfant which he has under way, and which is to be made available during the Sesquicentennial Celebration in 1950. Chairman Clarke said that Mr. Cassemeyer had told him that this is to be a semi-official trip, and that he had been informed by Government officials that many persons travel at Government expense for less worthy purposes, so that, since this is not a pleasure trip, the Government should pay part of the expenses of the trip. Mr. Cassemeyer said he would appreciate favorable action in this matter, since it would help establish a priority in securing passage on a steamboat during the month of July; 85,000 applications have been received by Transatlantic Lines for sailings during the period from March to October, 1948, with less than one-fourth the number of steamboats that sailed in pre-war times. The Commission discussed the subject, and agreed to an allotment of \$535, which is the minimum for a one-way passage, first class.



6. REZONING HISTORIC GEORGETOWN: The Commission ratified the action of Chairman Clarke and approved the letter sent by him to the Zoning Commission on February 11, 1948, in support of amendments proposed by them, which will protect "Historic Georgetown" from encroachment by commercial interests (Exhibit E).

(The Zoning Commission on February 25, 1948, rezoned 16 out of 17 acres involved, and thus adopted practically all of the amendments proposed (Exhibit F).

7. MEMORIAL STONE FOR THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT: The Secretary presented a design submitted by the National Park Service for a memorial stone which the Knights of Pythias propose to place in the Washington Monument.

The design had been submitted to Mr. Lawrie, who stated that it lacks artistic merit, and that he could see no reason why such a stone should be placed in the Washington Monument. The Commission concurred, and disapproved the design (Exhibit G). Also, the Commission suggested that the National Park Service refer the matter to the Washington National Monument Society for advice on the question as to whether or not they would allow memorial stones in the Monument, if designs would be received that would be acceptable from an artistic viewpoint.

8. ANDREW W. MELLON MEMORIAL FOUNTAIN: Mr. Finley reported that he had heard from members of the Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Committee that they propose having a sketch for a fountain made soon, which would be submitted to this Commission, to help them determine how much money the Committee would have to raise for the fountain.

9. INSPECTION OF THEATER OF OPERATIONS MEDALS: The Secretary presented three Theater of Operation Medals received from the Office of the Quartermaster General, War Department. The obverse of each of the three medals had been designed by Thomas Hudson Jones, sculptor, and the eagle on the reverse by Mr. A.A. Weinman, sculptor. These "samples" had been struck by the Medallie Art Company.



6. REZONING HISTORIC GEORGETOWN: The Commission ratified the action of

Chairman Clarke and approved the letter sent by him to the Zoning Commission

on February 11, 1948, in support of amendments proposed by them, which will

protect "Historic Georgetown" from encroachment by commercial interests (Exhibit F).

(The Zoning Commission on February 25, 1948, rezoned 16 out of 19 acres

involved, and thus adopted practically all of the amendments proposed (Exhibit F).

7. MONUMENTAL STONE FOR THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT: The Secretary presented a

design submitted by the National Park Service for a memorial stone which the

Knight of Pythias propose to place in the Washington Monument.

The design had been submitted to Mr. Lawrie, who stated that it lacks

artistic merit, and that he could see no reason why such a stone should be placed

in the Washington Monument. The Commission concurred, and disapproved the

design (Exhibit G). Also, the Commission suggested that the National Park Service

refer the matter to the Washington National Monument Society for advice on the

question as to whether or not they would allow memorial stones in the Monument,

if designs would be received that would be acceptable from an artistic viewpoint.

8. ANDREW W. MELLON MEMORIAL FOUNTAIN: Mr. Tinsley reported that he had

heard from members of the Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Committee that they propose

having a sketch for a fountain made soon, which would be submitted to this

Commission, to help them determine how much money the Committee would have to

raise for the fountain.

9. INSIGNION OF THEATER OF OPERATIONS MEDALS: The Secretary presented

three Theater of Operation Medals received from the Office of the Quartermaster

General, War Department. The obverse of each of the three medals had been

designed by Thomas Hudson Jones, sculptor, and the eagle on the reverse by

Mr. A.A. Weinman, sculptor. These "samples" had been struck by the Medallic

Art Company.



The Commission felt that the medals were much better than they had anticipated, and requested that they be placed in the Collection of Medals.

10. DIVISION OF MEDALS AND INSIGNIA, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: The Secretary stated that when Mr. Arthur DuBois called a few days ago and left the Theater of Operation Medals for the Commission, he brought up the subject of establishing a "Division of Medals and Insignia" in the newly established Department of Defense, which now comprises the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. Heretofore the War Department has secured its medals largely by competition; the Navy has a Committee on Medals and Insignia, but for the most part has been having them struck at the United States Mint. The Air Force has been securing its medals and insignia from the War Department.

The matter was brought to the attention of Mr. Lawrie, and he agreed that the establishment of a centralized Division of Medals and Insignia would be a step in the right direction. But he felt the work of designing medals should be distributed and should not all be done by their consultant.

The Commission agreed to having a letter sent by the Chairman to Secretary Forrestal of the Department of Defense, suggesting the establishment of a centralized Division of Medals and Insignia (Exhibit H).

11. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS:

(a) An application was received (No. 1174) from the Inspector of Buildings for the alteration of a building at 612 17th Street, N.W. Mr. Murphy inspected the drawings in detail, and approved them, subject to a separate application for an advertising sign. A report was sent to the Building Inspector accordingly.

(b). DESIGN FOR BANK BUILDING ON CALVERT STREET, near the Rock Creek Parkway: Mr. Petticord, of Mills and Petticord, submitted a completed drawing for the proposed building. Mr. Murphy considered the design to be satisfactory and Mr. Reinhard concurred.



The Commission felt that the medals were much better than they had  
previously been, and suggested that they be placed in the collection of medals.  
The Division of Medals and Insignia, Department of Defense, was  
informed of the Commission's findings and the fact that the medals  
were much better than they had previously been, and suggested that they  
be placed in the collection of medals. The Division of Medals and  
Insignia, Department of Defense, was informed of the Commission's  
findings and the fact that the medals were much better than they  
had previously been, and suggested that they be placed in the  
collection of medals. The Division of Medals and Insignia, Department  
of Defense, was informed of the Commission's findings and the fact  
that the medals were much better than they had previously been,  
and suggested that they be placed in the collection of medals.

The matter was brought to the attention of Mr. L. H. Smith, and he agreed  
that the establishment of a centralized Division of Medals and Insignia would  
be a step in the right direction. But he felt the work of designing medals  
should be centralized and should not all be done by their constituent.  
The Commission agreed to have a letter sent by the Chairman to  
the Division of Medals and Insignia, Department of Defense, suggesting the  
establishment of a centralized Division of Medals and Insignia.

#### II. APPLICATIONS FOR MEDALS:

(a) An application was received (No. 1174) from the Inspector of Buildings  
for the alteration of a building at 812 17th Street, N.W., Mr. Murphy.  
Inspected the drawings in detail, and approved them, subject to a separate  
application for an advertising sign. A report was sent to the Building

(b) Mr. J. H. Smith, of Mills and Tetterton, submitted a completed  
drawing for the proposed building. Mr. Murphy considered the design to be



12. (A) WORLD WAR II CEMETERIES: Brigadier General Thomas North, Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, in company with Mr. John F. Harbeson, presented plans and models for several World War II Cemeteries:

(a) Anzio, Italy: Design by Gugler, Kimball and Husted, Architects. The Commission discussed the design, as also a model, with Mr. Gugler, and gave preliminary approval to this second stage of the design (Exhibit I).

(b) Florence, Italy: Design by McKim, Mead and White, Architects. This cemetery is 5 miles south of Florence. The chapel is built into a hill. The model suggested alternate schemes, one the museum and chapel tied together by a wall, on which is to be placed the names of the missing dead; the other, the museum and chapel connected by an arcade. The Commission preferred the former. Both schemes suggested a shaft in front, and this the Commission advised should be given further study. Preliminary approval was given accordingly in a letter to General North (Exhibit I).

(c) Margraten, Holland: Coolidge, Shepley, Bulfinch and Abbott, Architects. The Commission considered the designs for the chapel and other related architectural elements. The Commission were satisfied with the general arrangement of the areas around the chapel site, but recommended that the design for the chapel should be given further study with a view to simplification. The Commission felt that the general scheme for the tower-chapel is appealing, and that with further study the idea may be developed into an outstanding architectural composition. Preliminary approval was given to the design (Exhibit I).

(d) Suresnes, France: William and Geoffrey Platt, Architects. The Commission were well pleased with the manner in which the architects planned extensions to the World War I Chapel at Suresnes, which had been designed by their distinguished father Charles A. Platt. The scheme favored was the one suggesting wings to the World War I Chapel. Preliminary approval was given in a letter to General North (Exhibit I).

(e) Henri Chappel, Belgium: The Commission inspected the designs by Holabird and Root for the cemetery at Henri Chapell, but were not satisfied with them and did not approve them. The Commission felt that the main design lacks monumental quality, dignity, and those other characteristics indicative of an important memorial. The Commission recommended restudy of the scheme (Exhibit I).

(B) WORLD WAR II CEMETERIES; Sculptors and Painters: The Commission discussed the subject, and sent a letter to General North embodying their recommendations on the subject (Exhibit J).



It is further noted that the above information is being furnished to you for your information only and is not intended to constitute an offer of insurance or any other financial product.

1. Aluminum is not black because of silver and shiny, polished, metallic.

(c) [redacted] advised that [redacted] had been approved by the [redacted] and [redacted] and [redacted] had been approved by the [redacted] and [redacted].

(b) Florence, Italy: Letter by Berlin, Rome and Paris, Washington.  
This country is 3 miles south of Florence. The object is only take a hill.  
The hotel suggested slightly below, use the same as the first time.  
Whether by a well, on which it is to place the name of the mining claim;  
the other, the museum of chapel connected by an arcade. The Cathedral  
restored one tower. Both columns suggested a wall in front, and this was  
Cathedral added walls by glass facing stone. Initially approved  
was given accordingly in a letter to General Jones (March 1).

(a) Particulars, including, possibly, minutes and exhibits.  
The Commission considered the designs for the Chapel and other related architectural elements. The Commission was satisfied with the general arrangement of the space around the Chapel site, but recommended that the design for the Chapel should be given further study with a view to finalizing it. The Commission felt that the proposed scheme for the Chapel is appealing, and that with further study and time may be developed into an outstanding architectural composition. It unanimously approved the design for the Chapel as (b) (1).

(A) Summary: During 1944 and 1945, the following were well known to the members of the organization in which the activities planned by the organization were well known to the members of the organization, which had been designed by the organization to be well known to the members of the organization. The scheme favored was the

of the same (Exhibit 1).

\* (b) (5) DPP, (b) (5) ACP, and (b) (5) ADP



13. EXPANSION OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HEALTH: The Public Buildings Administration presented designs and model for the proposed expansion of the National Institute of Health, at Bethesda, Md. The following were present during the discussion, representing that office:

Hon. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings;  
Mr. G. S. Underwood, Supervising Architect,  
Mr. A. S. Thorn, Assistant Supervising Architect,  
Mr. L. L. Hunter, Assistant Chief of Design,  
Mr. S. E. Sanders, Chief Site Planner, also  
D. R. E. Dyer, Director, National Institute of Health, Public Health Service,  
Dr. Norman H. Topping, Consultant, National Institute of Health,  
Mr. Albert F. Siepert, Executive Officer, National Institute of Health.

Mr. Reynolds opened the discussion by saying,---

"We have an appropriation which has been transferred from the Public Health Service to us for a medical research center at Bethesda, where the National Institute of Health is now located. The authority also extends to the purchase of additional property, for which we are now negotiating.

A bill is pending in Congress to provide contract authorization, and so forth, to carry on the project, and we are attempting to advance it to the point where we can let a grading contract and road contract by July 1st of this year.

This matter has been presented to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and to the Montgomery County Planning Commission for their approval, and we have the approval of both of those Commissions. We now appear before you for your consideration of what we plan to do. At this point I turn it over to Mr. Underwood."

Mr. Underwood said,--I think the Commissioner has properly introduced this by saying that both Commissions have approved this. This is the study model (which was displayed). Most of the members of the Commission will remember the present group of buildings, of which this is the administration building (indicating). The buildings in gray and red are the buildings that are there. The buildings in the coral color are what we propose to build in various sections. We intend to build this building first, then the heating plant if we decide finally that it shall go ~~there~~ here. Then we will build these other parts of the service section, which, as you see from the contour, lies in a much lower elevation than the main building. Following that will be the housing, which will be vital to this project, because there will be probably the greatest medical center here in America, if not in the world. I think I should have said a research medical center. But there always will be a large amount of personnel who will have to be housed on the property. This building sets back, I believe, 1600 feet from the road. The present Navy tower (on the Navy Medical Center across the street) sets back 800 feet.







This building is a purely functional building. We architects started by devising a plan that worked and then putting an envelope around it. It represents what we believe is the best usable type of space we can develop. This is the type of research that requires that the patients shall be almost immediately adjacent to the laboratory that is working on the particular disease, neuropsychiatry, cancer and heart disease. If I miss on these terms, the doctors will probably catch me later. But it is vital in the study of these diseases that the patient be really adjoining the laboratory. That is why it is necessary to get both types of service into the central span and the wings.

The building is thirteen stories high. It is terminated by a gymnasium on the top, which is used not by the staff but by the patients, and it is fifteen feet lower than the Navy tower. The entire height of the building from the ground up is 195 feet.

The design might be described as contemporary in character, which departs entirely from this pseudo-colonial architecture. It will, however, be tied into the other buildings in color. I don't want the colors used here to differentiate between the two classes of buildings. Red Brick will be used, select common brick. We will play a little bit with the mortar and masonry. We don't think it will in any way be offensive.

The plan of the roads as we have them is not completely crystallized in our minds, because we are of the opinion that some of these roads will have to be eliminated so there won't be any arterial traffic passing through from Rockville Pike and from Old Georgetown Road, which is the boundary at this point. We do rather believe that we will build in this first contract an amount of main road for construction purposes as well as for the use of the institution. . . . It might help if Mr. Sanders would give a short history of the work with the Maryland Park Commission on working out the boundary roads.

Chairman Clarke responded by saying that since a plan for the ultimate road system is to be submitted at a later date, it would be better to concentrate now on plans for the buildings. "What you want to do is clear the building so you can get your working drawings but on the site we agreed to before.

Dr. Dyer then explained their plans for medical research, saying, "This is a development of medical research. Most medical research started about fifty to seventy-five years ago, but mostly with the science of bacteriology, which began at that time. Most of the research at the present time is done with animals and by test tubes and then it is carried to the patient. That has worked very well as far as infectious diseases are concerned, but the result of what we might call our semi-conquest (or better than that) of infectious diseases has been an increase in the life expectancy of the population. Any baby that is born---a girl baby has a life expectancy of 69.7 years, which approaches the Biblical time limit. As a result, people in greater number will reach the age where cardiac conditions and heart diseases develop; cancer and other degenerative diseases become very, very important. We all know







that probably heart disease alone kills over half a million people every year. The development of recent techniques has made it possible to carry on research with patients. That doesn't mean that the patient won't get the best care or treatment, but the whole philosophy of it is that they have to take their share of clinical research.

As a result of that, this hospital has been largely designed for 150 beds for cardiac and degenerative disease, 150 beds for cancer, 150 beds for mental cases for research in mental cases.

The building, as Dr. Topping might explain to you, is designed for the particular purpose of bringing the laboratory worker and the patient closer to the necessary material. It is a sort of original plan for work of this sort. There isn't anything that compares with it any place in the world, although the necessity for it has been largely recognized. In planning the building and in planning the work for the building we have consulted very widely with medical scientists throughout the country and the same thing has been done by the Public Buildings Administration about the planning of the hospital. The whole philosophy of this is that this is not a treatment hospital. We don't like to refer to it as a research hospital, but it is a clinical facility, a clinical research facility, or a medical research center.

The question you asked with respect to where we expected to get patients should be answered. No patient will be admitted to the hospital on account of his financial status or because of what he is doing or whether he is a beneficiary of the Government or not. He will be admitted because he has a certain type of a certain disease which we want a group of patients to concentrate on at that time. We expect we will get a lot of our patients from the Veterans Administration, from the Army, from the Navy and our own Marine Hospital; but also we expect, if relations are built up properly (and we are sure we can get that), to get them referred in by private physicians and the local hospitals, possibly from places like Baltimore and New York and farther than that, merely because they have a certain type of heart disease, or something of that sort. Dr. Topping can give you a little more detail about the building. I might accentuate the fact that as far as securing patients is concerned, we expect this will be very attractive to the patient and to the physician, because of the excellence of medical care we expect to give."

Dr. Topping said: "I would like to say that we take some of the responsibility (the Public Health Service and some of our research people) for the way the building is laid out---the height and all. We said how we wanted it done and then PBA drew an envelope around our functions and the thing is being laid out on that basis, on the basis that a certain size nursing unit is an economical size nursing unit to operate."

Mr. Underwood remarked, "I think the modus operandi is pretty well crystallized and, as Dr. Topping says, is rather unchangeable; but the details have to have a great deal more study."

Chairman Clarke then asked the other members of the Commission if there are any objections to the designs and model.

Dr. Topping said, The model doesn't show the topography. Coming out of there, there is a great mass of trees, so you don't see that until you get there.

Mr. Murphy asked about the size of the hospital building, and Mr. Thorn said, "Approximately 800 feet long, 356 feet from the extreme of these wings to these wings." We would like an expression of general approval."

The Commission thereupon unanimously approved the plans up to this stage. A report was sent to Commissioner Reynolds (Exhibit K).



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
54 EAST LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL. 60601

...the Government is not... it will be... the Government is not... it will be...

...from the Army, from the Navy and our own Marine Hospital; but



14. REMOVAL OF TEMPORARY WAR BUILDINGS: In accordance with arrangements made, the Commission conferred with Commissioner Reynolds on the subject of removal of temporary war buildings. Mr. Reynolds said:

"We are seriously concerned with the scheduling of the removal of the temporary buildings. There has been a tremendous drive in the last two years for us to give up in every city of America rented space and that drive is not confined to cities outside Washington, but here also we have received direct instructions from the President as to what we are supposed to do.

Basically the problems are these in the District of Columbia. Prior to the war we rented 2,750,000 square feet of space. The population which we then served was 160,000 people. At that time there was close to 2.5 millions of space from the first World War. That included the Navy and Munitions Buildings on the south side of Constitution Avenue. We don't know what the population in Washington will be, but a year ago we figured that it would be down to 180,000 by 1950. It is approaching that now, as a matter of fact. I question whether it is going to be reduced materially at least for several years. As you analyze each Department, you begin to get into difficulty if you are going to try to reduce their size in Washington, other than through decentralization, and that is generally opposed.

The factors that make for large space use are: (1) the Public Debt; (2) the Department of State; (3) the large factor of the Veterans Administration, which is probably the largest single factor. Then there is the European Recovery Plan coming along, which is probably a five-year program. There is some reduction in space used by the war agencies, such as the War Assets Administration, which is going down, but a lot of that is in the field and not in Washington, so I cannot anticipate that in several years to come we will have less than 175,000.

The only building that was built for the housing of people is the Pentagon, and, although the Pentagon is very large in floor area, it does not accommodate more than about 24,000 to 25,000 at the maximum.

We have reduced our rental in Washington to where we are approaching 2 million square feet. We can't go any lower. We are using, in order to house the present load of the Government, every temporary building that we have, including temporaries out at McLean Gardens, temporaries near the Armory, and the only relief that we can see is for new construction, because, as you know, we started with a backlog before the war of over 5 million square feet, including rental buildings and temporary buildings.

Our thinking has been that in the removal of temporary buildings, the first ones that should be removed would be on the axis of the Mall, so as to bring back the sight lines, and so forth, and then start at the Lincoln Memorial and remove them gradually, moving toward the Capitol; in other words, clean up this area over here.

The President has told us that he would like to have us submit to Congress a request for an appropriation for the completion of the building at 21st and Virginia Avenue, an authorization for an appropriation. That is the building, the first unit of which was built for the War Department and has about 225,000 square feet. The drawings are pretty well advanced on that, as you gentlemen know. When we get it finished, it will have in the neighborhood of one million square feet, probably slightly less.







but again that does not meet the problem. We will get some relief if we can get the General Accounting Office housed in a new building. Legislation has been approved in the House for that purpose and is pending in the Senate. The Hearings will be held in about ten days and I am hopeful that we can get that.

But unfortunately, that releases spaces or quite a percentage of space which is not very good for personnel occupancy because they have extensive files which are active and they have to have some people with them. Our thought was that we would move the active materials in the files into the new building. It will release the temporary buildings in McLean Gardens, which we could give to somebody else.

Our next project in point of priority other than the building we are working on now in the Suitland area involves obtaining quickly space for this decennial census. We need about 300,000 square feet to do that.

Chairman Clarke remarked, The so-called Census Building has never been occupied by Census.

Mr. Reynolds replied, "No and never will be. The Census now is up to 500,000 square feet, which is beyond that building. They need 800,000 square feet. A building to provide that and a little excess will cost 7.5 million. I don't know whether we can get that through Congress. When the census is over we can use it for other purposes. The estimates they made at the time we built this building for decentralizing their activities amounted to \$7,600,000, which is about the cost of the building. So you have an excellent argument there.

"We are extremely interested in getting a building over on the west side of the old Naval Hospital. That building was proposed at the time for the Department of the Navy. That situation has shaken down to the point where we do not know whether they will need a building of that size or not. My feeling is that we should build a building without any particular nomenclature and clean up that whole area (where the brewery is) and use it for any purpose that seems appropriate at the time it is completed. The hill on which the old naval hospital stands will be cleaned up eventually by a park. President Roosevelt thought there should be a monument there and not use it for building purposes because it is too high. It would be obnoxious in the skyline.

"So the only relief for the temporary building situation in Washington is for new buildings and it runs into a great amount of money. The extension to the building at 21st Street and Virginia Avenue is estimated to cost 42 million dollars and the Navy building will cost in the neighborhood of 55 million dollars.

Chairman Clarke asked if the studies for the Navy building have been carried very far. Mr. Reynolds replied, "Yes, quite a little, to the point where we can get rather definite estimates of what it will cost. You have there rather an interesting problem in transportation and the elimination of grade crossings on Virginia Avenue and New Hampshire Avenue, but it is one proposal that we have made in Washington that I believe meets the full concurrence of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. We are providing ample parking. We are providing just blocks of property literally and we are in the process of buying some of the property now.

To get buildings for the District of Columbia is a tremendously







difficult problem. I am having trouble now with the General Accounting Office because the building is in the District of Columbia. The District has no representation; it has no votes. The question was raised the other day, "How can we tell our people back home that they cannot have buildings and then we vote a building for the District of Columbia?"

"So the history of the thing has been that you have to tie the District of Columbia in with a building program outside of the District of Columbia, or generally you cannot get it through. Of course, if we ~~were~~ to get a major recession, I think we ~~would~~ have no difficulty in getting buildings; but presently I am quite discouraged about this temporary building situation as a whole. I am very discouraged.

The question of removing the old Navy and Munitions buildings of World War I was discussed, but it was indicated that the new so-called "Navy Building" would have to be built before that could be done.

Regarding high cost and building materials, Mr. Reynolds said, "Of course, we do not have the practical situation where building costs are high and unfortunately I don't think Congress will accede to the big sums necessary. They can't possibly do that. Cost will recede some, I am sure, but not a great deal.

"There is a tremendous demand for materials and labor, and, as long as there is, the Government has taken the position they should not press some of these building. The buildings will come if you get unemployment in the building ~~trade~~ or in the industry furnishing materials for the trades."

Mr. Finley asked if steps couldn't be taken to remove the building on Thirteenth Street. Mr. Reynolds replied, "It is advantageously located for information services. I am more interested really in restoring the sight line on the Mall. That has a high priority.

To that Mr. Finley said, "I should think this little building at the head of Pennsylvania Avenue, marring the view of the Treasury, is a very important thing to get out. It is so small it couldn't be very essential. The information services, if they want to be located on Pennsylvania Avenue, can get some other building."

Mr. Reynolds said the temporary buildings along the Mall, those near the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial are an eyesore in the landscape and that he would like to see them removed as soon as possible. But new buildings are necessary for this. He thought an authorization for the new "Navy Building" could be secured in two years. One building a year is as







much as can be expected.

Chairman Clarke asked, "Do you suppose the unification of the command is going to have an effect on that program so that instead of putting it there, it will be put over near the Pentagon, or something of that sort? It is bound to have some effect."

Mr. Reynolds replied, "What may happen will be that the Navy will continue to use the building we built on the hill up there south of the Arlington National Cemetery and it may be a solution to the problem to build another building over there adjacent to the Pentagon. There is plenty of room to do it, you know. We could put up another for National Defense and this building then would be for the departments and agencies. That is the reason I would built it (the new building at the old Brewery site west of 23d Street) without a nomenclature. I personally believe, just looking at it from the viewpoint of the beautification of Washington and long-range planning, that the area should be cleaned out before it gets into private ownership and apartment houses are probably built."

Chairman Clarke said, "By all means. Have you bought the brewery?"

Mr. Reynolds replied, "No, but we have an agreement with the brewery people. They have some strategically located property. . . and I would rather buy these other properties (now) because it gives us more of a strategic position in that area than we would have if we bought the brewery site."

General Grant remarked, "There is a little bit of pressure for apartment houses in that neighborhood because of the fact that the land per square foot is not too high and the high cost of building makes that feature attractive. I have run down about three people who are all ready to build apartment houses in that general neighborhood, although not on the brewery site."

In conclusion, Chairman Clarke said, "I appreciate your keeping us up-to-date on this. There isn't very much we can do about it except hope. What you need is the urge on the part of the man on top to want it badly enough so it can be done."

Mr. Reynolds replied, "That is right. The situation, however, in the building industry has been such that I don't think any President would be pushing it, but he has really taken hold of this building over here at 21st and Virginia Avenue (occupied by the State Department). I don't know whether we can get that through Congress or not. Now is not a good time to get anything through Congress. In an election year you just can't do a thing."

15. ARTICLE ON MUNICIPAL ART: General Grant informed Chairman Clarke that he desired a general article on the Fine Arts in the District of Columbia for the proposed publication on a Comprehensive Plan for Washington.

16. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION: The Commission decided to hold their next meeting in Washington on Wednesday, March 24, 1948.

The Commission adjourned at 3:30 p.m. The Commission were the guests of Mr. Murphy at a delightful luncheon in his new office, 1518 P Street, N.W.







COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON

AMENDMENT TO THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF  
FINE ARTS,

Proposed by Mr. Sterne, in lieu of paragraph 2, page 6, insert---

Mr. Sterne remarked that the bronze and models would have to be transported and the completed figures would have to be returned at the expense of the United States Government. This would add to the cost.

However, Mr. Sterne considered the price of 212,000 for two figures as stated by Mr. Thompson, fantastically high, and recommended that, before a contract is signed for casting these statues, his office make further inquiry about prices either in this country or abroad.

EXHIBIT A



THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

FINE ARTS

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Mr. Sterne remarked that the bronze and models would have to

be procured and the cost of the bronze would have to be paid by

the expense of the United States Government. This would add to the

cost.

However, Mr. Sterne considered the price of \$12,000 for two

figures as stated by Mr. Thompson, particularly high, and

that, before a contract is signed for the purchase of the figures, the office

would further inquire about prices given in this country in regard

WESTERN A



COPY

The Secretary of the Interior,  
Washington 25, D.C.

Jan.30, 1948.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Since observing the preliminary preparations for construction of the proposed Pan American Union Annex in U.S.Reservation No. 384, it is increasingly apparent that the structure would constitute defacement of the Constitution Avenue building line and would effect irreparable permanent damage to the plan for the development of Washington's Central Area. It emphasizes the foresight displayed by the Commission of Fine Arts in recognizing the threat to the Federal City Plan when the structure was first proposed and the wisdom of its efforts to ameliorate the damage through its assistance in the preparation of alternate plans which would have placed the structure within the boundaries of the present Pan American Union site.

We do not believe that the present Congress would condone this deplorable defacement of the Constitution Avenue plan if the matter were brought to its attention by the interested federal agencies and Members of Congress were invited to study the proposition at the site. We request, therefore, that the Commission of Fine Arts join with the United States Department of the Interior and the Federal Works Agency in urging the Congress to enact legislation necessary to halt the present construction and safeguard the plan for the Central Area by prohibiting the erection of any structure on Constitution Avenue in conflict with the established building lines.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,

Secretary of the Interior

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman,  
Commission of Fine Arts,  
Washington 25, D.C.

I concur:

Philip B. Fleming, Maj.Gen.USA,  
Federal Works Administrator

EXHIBIT B



The Secretary of the Interior,  
Washington 25, D.C.

Jan. 20, 1933.

Dear Mr. Nathan:

Since observing the preliminary proposition for a reservation of the proposed San Antonio Union Trust in U.S. Reservation No. 304, it is interestingly apparent that the structure would consist of the Donation Avenue building line and would effect irrevocable permanent damage to the plan for the development of San Antonio's Central Area. It emphasizes the fact that the proposed Commission of this area is recommending the plan to the Federal City Plan when the structure was first proposed and the action of the efforts to eliminate the damage through its assistance in the proposed action of alternate plans which would have placed the structure within the boundaries of the present San Antonio Union Trust.

We do not believe that the present Commission would endorse this irrevocable development of the Donation Avenue plan if the matter were brought to its attention by the interested Federal agencies and members of Congress were invited to study the proposition at the time. We request, therefore, that the Commission of this area join with the United States Department of the Interior and the Federal Works Agency in urging the Congress to enact legislation necessary to halt the present construction and authorize the plan for the Central Area by providing the erection of any structure in San Antonio which is in conflict with the attached building line.

Sincerely yours,

J. L. Nathan

Secretary of the Interior

Mr. William B. Smith, Chairman,  
Commission of this area,  
Washington 25, D.C.

J. Nathan

William B. Smith, Chairman,  
Federal Works Administration



## The Commission of Fine Arts

Washington

February 3, 1948.

The Honorable Julius A. Krug  
The Secretary of the Interior  
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This is in acknowledgment of your letter of January 30th related to a new building, to serve as an annex to the Pan American Union, which is now under construction on a triangular plot of land on Constitution Avenue between 18th and 19th Streets. The Commission of Fine Arts do not share your view that this proposed building, originally designed by one of this country's most eminent architects, the late Paul P. Cret, and developed further by his successors, the firm of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, will "effect irreparable permanent damage to the plan for development of Washington's Central Area."

The Commission of Fine Arts have followed the development of this project from the time of its inception in May 16, 1928, the date upon which the Congress of the United States authorized the erection of a Building for the use of the Pan American Union on a U. S. Reservation. The story of the controversy which preceded the final decision to locate the Pan American Annex on the site on Constitution Avenue between 18th and 19th Streets, is long, involved, and not worth outlining here. IT should be noted, however, that while the Commission of Fine Arts aided in the study of other sites for this building, they always have been of the opinion that the site bounded by Constitution Avenue, 19th Street, and Virginia Avenue was the most suitable from the points of view of aesthetics, of convenience, and of the relation of the proposed building to the Central Composition.

The site for the Pan American Annex was selected deliberately, and the design was carefully adjusted to meet the requirements of the triangular shaped plot on which it is to stand. Both the Fine Arts and the Planning Commissions are thoroughly aware of the fact that this new building will not line up with the other buildings to the west along Constitution Avenue. The fact is, we desire to terminate the long view looking easterly across the landscaped areas between the row of existing buildings and Constitution Avenue by placing an architectural gem, the Pan American Annex, in a position of prominence close to the Avenue.



Washington

February 1, 1938

The Honorable Julius A. Krug  
The Secretary of the Interior  
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This is in acknowledgment of your letter of January 30th relating to a new building, to serve as an annex to the Pan American Union, which is now under construction on a triangular piece of land on Constitution Avenue between 18th and 19th Streets. The Commission of Fine Arts do not share your view that this proposed building, originally designed by one of this country's most eminent architects, the late Paul H. Cret, and developed further by his successors, the firm of Harrison, Reed & Livingston and later, with modifications, the firm of Harkness, is a permanent damage to the plan for development of Washington's "Central Area."

The Commission of Fine Arts have followed the development of this project from the time of its inception in May 15, 1933, and have been with the Secretary of the Interior since the inception of a building for the use of the Pan American Union on a triangular piece of land on Constitution Avenue between 18th and 19th Streets, which preceded the final decision to locate the Pan American Annex on the site on Constitution Avenue between 18th and 19th Streets, is long, involved, and not without outstanding issues. It should be noted, however, that while the Commission of Fine Arts is in the study of other sites for this building, they have been of the opinion that the site bounded by Constitution Avenue, 18th Street, and Virginia Avenue was the most suitable from the point of view of accessibility, of convenience, and of the relation of the proposed building to the Central Composition.

The site for the Pan American Annex was selected deliberately, and the design was carefully studied to meet the requirements of the triangular shaped plot on which it is to stand. From the time the site was selected, the Commission was thoroughly aware of the fact that the building will line up with the other buildings to the west along Constitution Avenue. The fact is, we desire to eliminate the long view looking easterly across the landscape from the town of existing buildings and Constitution Avenue by placing an architectural gem, the Pan American Annex, in a position of prominence close to the Avenue.



In my judgment, the plans for no single structure in Washington have received more study, more careful consideration, or more collaborative effort on the part of the appropriately constituted governmental agencies, than have those for this new building for the Pan American Union. This building is not "in conflict with the established building lines;" the Commission of Fine Arts, in collaboration with the Planning Commission, established the lines for this new building and these are well within the so-called "building lines" of the border street and avenues which surround it.

I cannot imagine anything which would do more to injure the harmonious relations which now obtain with our neighbors, the South American Republics, than at this late date to make any move which would tend to delay the construction of a building which the Pan American Union has contemplated constructing since 1928, a period of almost 20 years. It has been most embarrassing to the Director of the Pan American Union over this long period of time because of the obstructionist tactics of your predecessor in office, who succeeded in holding up the construction of this building for several years, during a period when it could have been constructed for a fraction of what it will cost to build -to-day.

Accordingly, I hope you will withdraw your objection so as no longer to ~~w~~ embarrass the officials of the Pan American Union and those of the South American Republics. I can assure you that the building will be one of the most handsome and notable structures in Washington and thus assume a place of dignity and of good order in the great Central Composition of the National Capital.

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke  
Chairman



In my judgment, the plans for an office structure in Washington have received more study, more careful consideration, and more collaborative effort on the part of the representative committees of the Governmental agencies, than have those for the new building for the Pan American Union. This building is not in accord with the general plan for the "Building Line" of the Commission of Fine Arts, in cooperation with the Planning Commission, established the lines for this new building. The site is well within the so-called "Building Line" of the new street and avenue plan around it.

I cannot imagine anyone who would be more to desire the harmonious relations which now obtain with the Secretary, the Secretary General, than at this time to make any more which would tend to delay the construction of a building which the Pan American Union has contemplated constructing since 1928. A period of almost 20 years. It has been most embarrassing to the Director of the Pan American Union over this long period of time because of the construction of over 200,000 square feet in office, and recommended in building up the construction of this building for several years, during a period when it could have been constructed for a fraction of what it will cost to build today.

Accordingly, I hope you will withdraw your objection as far as possible to the office of the Pan American Union and that of the North American Republics. I can assure you that the building will be one of the most handsome and notable structures in Washington and that it will be a place of dignity and of good order in the great Capital of the National Capital.

Very truly yours,

Wm. L. Gurnea  
Secretary



## THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR BUILDING

Washington 25, D. C.

February 4, 1948.

My dear Doctor Lleras:

On January 30 I addressed letters to the Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts urging that their respective commissions reconsider their former actions in approving the construction of the Pan American Union Annex on U. S. Reservation 384. I took this action after observing the preliminary construction work at the site. I was then visibly impressed that the protrusion of the building to so great a distance beyond the established Constitution Avenue building line would effect irreparable damage to the plan for the development of this beautiful avenue and that the work should be halted immediately.

I now appeal directly to the Pan American Union for its cooperation in this matter. I know that you are equally as interested as I am in the preservation and enhancement of the beauty of the settings for Washington's public buildings, and I believe that you will be anxious to cooperate by agreeing to any alternate plans that would at once serve your purpose and insure the future attractiveness of our National Capital. I am requesting, therefore, that the progress of construction of the Pan American Union Annex be suspended immediately and that a conference be arranged between the several interested agencies for the purpose of seeking an agreeable solution to the problem. I would greatly appreciate your prompt and a favorable consideration of this request.

Sincerely yours,

(SGD) J. A. Krug

Secretary of the Interior.

Dr. Alberto Lleras,  
Director General,  
Pan American Union.

CC: National Capital Park and Planning Commission  
Commission of Fine Arts







## NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D. C.

February 6, 1948.

Honorable J. A. Krug  
Secretary of the Interior  
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Pan American Union Annex in U.S. Res. 384.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

Confirming my verbal statement to you Friday evening, January 30, that same afternoon the National Capital Park and Planning Commission gave very careful and sympathetic consideration to your letter of January 30, 1948, relative to the location of the Annex for the Pan American Building.

In view of the fact that this Commission had acted favorably upon this building's location on Constitution Avenue south of Virginia Avenue, after innumerable efforts had been made through a long period of years to find an equally suitable site that would not do violence to the street system and traffic conditions, the Commission felt itself obligated not to rescind its previous action on the spur of the moment.

Probably no individual site problem in Washington has received more study on the part of all concerned than this one. While the selection of the site and the legislation authorizing its use by the Pan American Union (1929) antedated the construction of the building for the Interior Department, the mutual relations of the two were considered at the time both by the Commission of Fine Arts and our Commission.

Plate 13, opposite page 61 of our Commission's Annual Report for 1930 shows the utilization of both sites, and the design of the proposed Pan American Annex conforms with the requirements enunciated at that time on page 60 of the said report, which requirements were based upon the views of the 1901 McMillan Commission and adopted by the Commission of Fine Arts after its establishment in 1910. Some of us have thought the extension of the building itself ahead of the fronts of the buildings to the west actually an advantage in balancing the similar buttress of the hill and Pharmaceutical Building at the other end of Constitution Avenue, and screening from view the back of the Pan American Building as you drive east on the Avenue.

Hence, you will see that the proposed building cannot readily be conceded by those who have studied the subject for so many years, to be a defacement of Constitution Avenue or damaging to the plan for the development of Washington's Central Area. Indeed, all the other compromise solutions heretofore proposed would, to a greater or lesser extent,



January 1, 1942

Memorandum  
Secretary of the Interior  
Washington, D. C.

Subject: National Archives Building

Very respectfully,  
[Signature]

During my verbal statement to you Friday evening, January 1, 1942, I stated that the National Archives Building is a very important and significant contribution to the Nation's history and that it is a building of the highest quality and character.

In view of the fact that this Commission had acted favorably upon the building's location, the Commission's report of January 1, 1942, after innumerable efforts had been made through a long period of years to find an equally suitable site that would not do violence to the street system and traffic conditions, the Commission felt that it was not to consider the previous action on the part of the Government.

Probably no individual site problem in Washington has received more study on the part of all concerned than this one. While the selection of the site and the legislation authorizing its use by the Interior Union (1929) antedated the construction of the building for the Interior Department, the mutual relations of the two were considered at the time both by the Commission of Fine Arts and our Commission.

Plate 13, opposite page 61 of our Commission's Annual Report for 1930 shows the utilization of both sites, and the design of the proposed building. The Commission's report of January 1, 1942, contained at that time on page 60 of the said report, which recommendations were based upon the views of the 1901 McMillan Commission and adopted by the Commission of Fine Arts in 1901. The Commission's report of January 1, 1942, the extension of the building itself ahead of the troops of the building to the west actually an advantage in extending the building out of the hill and Constitutional Building at the corner of Constitution Avenue, and extending from the hill to the west of the building as you drive east on the Avenue.

Hence, you will see that the proposed building cannot readily be located in those areas which are subject to the plan for the development of Washington's Central Post Office, all the other commercial buildings, and the proposed building, as a matter of fact, is a building of the highest quality and character.



justify such objections except the one which would place the new building within the present grounds of the Pan American Union. This latter solution would involve serious encroachment upon the said grounds and the forfeiture of investments made by the Union with the sanction of law.

The Commission, however, desired me to offer any assistance its staff or I could render you in further explaining the situation or in your study of it. I apologize for the delay in preparing this written answer to your letter, which has been necessitated by the time needed to check the facts again and the performance of other urgent duties.

Very respectfully yours,

U. S. Grant, 3rd  
Major General, U.S.A., Ret.  
Chairman

USG:md



family with objection being made which would place the law before  
within the present attitude of the American Union. This latter condition  
would involve serious arrangements upon the said grounds and the  
of investment made by the Union with the coming of law.

The Commission, however, desired as to effect any arrangement the  
or I could render you in further explanation the situation as to your study of  
it. I therefore for the delay in preparing this written answer to your letter,  
which has been recommended by the law board to which the facts and the  
performance of other things.

Very respectfully yours,

E. J. [unclear]  
[unclear]  
[unclear]

62100



*Return to T.S. Settle*  
PAN AMERICAN UNION

Reply of the Director General of the  
Pan American Union to the letter of  
the Secretary of the Interior

February 5, 1948.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

I have just received your letter of February 4th, informing me that on January 30th you wrote to the Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, urging that their respective agencies reconsider their former action in approving the construction of the Pan American Union Annex on U. S. Reservation 384. You state that you "took this action after observing the preliminary construction work at the site", when you were "visibly impressed that the protrusion of the building line would effect irreparable damage to the plan for the development of this beautiful avenue and that the work should be halted immediately."

You are now appealing to the Pan American Union for its cooperation in this matter, and you request "that the progress of construction of the Pan American Union Annex be suspended immediately and that a conference be arranged between the several interested agencies for the purpose of seeking an agreeable solution to the problem."

Your communication, Mr. Secretary, coming as it does from one holding high office in the Government of the United States, has received my very special attention. But unfortunately I am not in a position to accede to your request. I feel sure, however, that when you have become familiar with my reasons you will agree that they are entirely valid.

I have no authority to take an important decision of this nature, which would seriously affect the interests of the Pan American Union, because my function is merely to execute the instructions of the governments of the twenty-one American Republics, including the United States, whose representatives on the Governing Board of the Union direct the affairs of this international institution. The course this matter has taken over the past twenty years--from the day on which the United States Congress authorized the construction of an administration building for the Pan American Union on the lot in question--has made it necessary for all the American governments to intervene repeatedly through their representatives on the Governing Board, as well as to adopt resolutions that it is my duty to carry into effect. I am not authorized in any way to make modifications in these decisions as long as the situation exists which was created, after long and careful deliberation, by the Congress of the United States and the two official Commissions to which you refer in your letter.

After the United States Congress set apart the lot bounded by Constitution and Virginia Avenues and 18th and 19th Streets for the Pan American Union Annex, the Governing Board engaged the services of Dr. Paul P. Cret, one







of the most eminent architects of this country, to draw up the plans for the new structure. Once completed, the plans were submitted to the Fine Arts Commission, an agency of the United States Government, whose members are appointed by the President, and whose approval is required for the erection of any public building in the District of Columbia. This Commission originally approved the plans for the new Pan American building in December of 1934. Confirmation of this approval was issued on November 17, 1939, and once again on February 22, 1946. The reasons for these successive confirmations are clear: the Governing Board of the Pan American Union was unwilling to order work begun on the annex, in spite of the urgent need for additional office space, until the Fine Arts Commission had had an opportunity to study carefully various objections that had been raised to the project, and it was only after the Governing Board was fully convinced that the Commission had considered and overruled these objections that the Board decided to start work on the new building. The last letter from the Chairman of the Commission, dated February 25, 1946, states:

"I am pleased to inform you that at a meeting held on February 22, 1946, the Commission of Fine Arts reconfirmed the action taken on December 3, 1934, approving the design by the late Dr. Paul P. Cret for the Pan American Annex, to be built on the triangle authorized by Congress on December 23, 1929, at Constitution Avenue and Nineteenth Street, Northwest."

Some suggestions made by your predecessor in the Interior Department, Mr. Harold Ickes, were studied by the Governing Board of the Pan American Union, which then requested the architects to make certain modifications in the plans, in order to transfer the service entrance to Nineteenth Street. After the revised plans were submitted to the Fine Arts Commission, the Chairman, Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, sent the following letter to the architects:

"The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting today, approved the revised designs for the facades of the Pan American Annex, on the triangle at Constitution Avenue and Nineteenth Street, Northwest, submitted by Mr. Livingston of your firm.

"The Commission were particularly pleased with the scheme showing the proposed roadway entrance from Nineteenth Street. A small parking area is to be incorporated at the northwest corner of the property, more or less as indicated on a print of the plan."

As regards the other agency of the United States Government, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, its approval of the plans for the construction of the administration building of the Union on the site mentioned were also secured. That Commission's Chairman, General Ulysses S. Grant, was present at the August 1947 meeting of the Fine Arts Commission and expressed his concurrence in the latest modification in the plans, calling for the removal of the service entrance to Nineteenth Street. General Grant himself proposed the addition of a parking area in the northwest corner.

As you see, Mr. Secretary, the Fine Arts Commission has taken cognizance of all the objections to the plans for our new building that have been







raised over this long period of years. At one time, as you point out, it was suggested that the administration building be erected on the land now occupied by the Pan American Union. On this subject the Commission expressed the following opinion, with which the Union is in full agreement:

"The Commission hesitates to advise locating additional buildings in the property of the Pan American Union. The buildings and landscape of the Pan American Union are today among the most admired of all the sights in the national capital; also they have an international reputation as an example of elegance and good taste."

At the time I took up my duties as Director General of the Pan American Union last June, the Governing Board had already instructed the architects to prepare the final plans for the building, and ever since my installation I have been doing everything possible to expedite this project, in accordance with the wishes of that important international body. I believe it is obvious how necessary it is to execute without further delay this plan which has been in abeyance for the past twenty years, but I wish to make doubly sure, Mr. Secretary, that you will understand clearly that this is far from being a decision taken upon sudden impulse:

a) The administration building should have been constructed shortly after the United States Congress, at the request of the Pan American Union, authorized its erection on this site. During all the years that have elapsed the development of the Union's program, and of inter-American activities in general, has been cramped by the space limitations of our present building.

b) The delay in constructing the annex has been very costly to the Union. The architects' first estimate for the cost of the building amounted to about \$600,000, whereas the last estimate comes to \$2,400,000, an increase that reflects the rise in the cost of materials and labor in the interval. Just to show how building construction in Washington has gone up, the Governing Board approved an estimate of \$1,500,000 for the building in July of 1947, and before a year had passed it was necessary to revise this figure up to \$2,400,000, the increase being due almost entirely to the delay. In consequence, the Governing Board is determined to have the building constructed at once, not only because of our pressing need for more office space, but also in order to avoid the danger that increasing building costs (particularly on this type of construction required along Constitution Avenue) might in the end make it impossible to erect the structure at all.

c) Even before completing the reorganization of the Union's services decided upon by the American governments, which involves a considerable increase in the program of the Union and consequently in its need for office space, we have been obliged to rent a building at Connecticut Avenue and Columbia Road (at a time of tremendous difficulty in locating suitable accommodations) in order to house temporarily some of the offices of the Union, as well as the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, formerly lodged in the Pan American Building. Pan American conferences continue to assign new duties to the Union, which in turn results in an increasing need for office facilities. After the reorganization of the Inter-American System has been approved by the Ninth International Conference of American States meeting in Bogotá this year, our problem will become truly acute. The new building, which has been needed for so long, cannot be postponed again. It is obvious that any







further delay or change in our present plans would be disastrous. The American governments would not give their consent to any step I might take to postpone execution of their instructions in this matter, and I should find it impossible to explain to them the need for such a drastic change in our plans after having reported to them that all the requirements had been met for the construction of this building in Washington. The Governing Board of the Union did not order the work to proceed until it was positive that these requirements had been met. I think you will appreciate that, under the circumstances, it would not be possible for me to discuss at this time with the agencies you refer to the question of halting work on the building, which would imply, in principle, at least, my consent to the reopening of this long debate. In this discussion the function of the Pan American Union was limited to making available to the authorized agencies of the Government the data they require before giving their permission for the construction.

In question like this, involving aesthetic appreciation of intangible and subjective values, I do not feel competent to discuss a subject with which the Fine Arts Commission has already dealt and which it has settled with full authority. Nor would I care to comment on any action that you, Mr. Secretary, might care to take to suspend the work already under way, which will be continued as planned until we meet with some legal obstacle with which we are unable to cope. Only in this event would I feel justified in bringing the matter to the attention of the Governments of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States Government, which is represented on the Governing Board of the Union and which was also represented on the special committees charged with studying the plans for the new building.

It is with sincere regret, therefore, Mr. Secretary, that I feel obliged, for the reasons I have outlined, to decline your invitation to take part in the conference you would like to call, and also to withhold the order to suspend operations on the project, which are being carried forward with all the speed that our critical need for space demands. I hope, Mr. Secretary, that you will appreciate the position I am in and that you will agree that the reasons I have given you at such length are cogent and not dictated by caprice or stubbornness. If, however, you think it desirable to raise the question at a meeting of the Governing Board of the Pan American Union--which I am not authorized to do myself--I might say that it would be quite in order to suggest to the Department of State that the United States representative on our Governing Board take the initiative in the matter. The complete familiarity which the State Department and the United States representative on the Board have with our situation and our requirements might be very helpful in considering other factors of the problem than those of a purely aesthetic nature which have already been passed upon by the Fine Arts Commission.

I beg of you, Mr. Secretary, to pardon the length of this letter, which is explained by my unwillingness to decline your request without making sure you were aware of my many urgent reasons for doing so.

In view of the fact that portions of your letter to me have been reprinted in the Washington press, I feel sure you will have no objection to my







sending copies of this letter to the newspapers, for the information of the reading public.

I beg to remain, my dear Mr. Secretary,

Very sincerely yours,

Alberto Lleras  
Director General

The Honorable  
The Secretary of the Interior  
Washington, D. C.







PAN AMERICAN UNION

Washington 6, D. C. U.S.A.

February 6, 1948.

My dear Mr. Clarke:

I have received from Mr. Caemmerer a copy of your letter to the Secretary of the Interior which you were good enough to have him send me. Many thanks for your courtesy.

I need hardly assure you that everyone connected with the Pan American Union is deeply appreciative of the position that you have taken in this regrettable incident. At the same time, in pointing out the unfortunate impression that is being created in the minds of our Latin American neighbors, you are rendering a very real service to our relations with the Latin American Republics and to the cause of inter-American understanding. I hope that as a result of your communication, the incident will be closed, and with renewed expression of appreciation, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

William Manger  
Assistant Director

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke  
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts  
Interior Department Building  
Washington, D. C.



THE AMERICAN LITERARY  
WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 11, 1914.  
February 11, 1914.

My dear Mr. Gilmore:

I have received from Mr. Gannister a copy  
of your letter to the Secretary of the Interior which  
you were good enough to have him send me. Very truly  
yours,

I need hardly assure you that everyone who  
reads the American Literary is deeply appreciative  
of the position that you have taken in this regard.  
At the same time, in pointing out the un-  
fortunate impression that is being created in the minds  
of our Latin American neighbors, you are rendering a  
very real service to our relations with the Latin American  
world and to the cause of inter-American understanding.  
I hope that as a result of your communication, the matter  
will be closed, and with renewed expression of appreciation,  
I am,

Most sincerely yours,

William Brewster  
Assistant Director

Mr. Gilmore D. Gilmore  
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts  
Interior Department Building  
Washington, D. C.



"An Act authorizing the erection for the sole use of the Pan American Union of an office building on the square of land lying between Eighteenth Street, C Street, and Virginia Avenue, northwest, in the city of Washington. The plans for the said building to be subject to the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts. Approved May 16, 1928, (Public No. 404, 70th Congress, first Session).

Senate Report No. 12, 71st Congress, on S. J. Res. 5, proposed amending the Act of May 16, 1928, so as to designate in lieu of the triangle on the north side of Virginia Avenue, the triangle "bounded on the north by Virginia Avenue, northwest, on the south by B Street, northwest, and on the west by Nineteenth Street, northwest." Approved December 23, 1929.

The following letter from the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts explains the reason for the change of location:

The Commission of Fine Arts,  
Washington, May 11, 1929.

Hon. Henry W. Keyes, Chairman,  
Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,  
United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

My dear Senator Keyes: Replying to your letter of May 7, I would say that the location proposed for the Pan American Annex, as authorized in the joint Resolution (S.J.Res.5) is acceptable to the Commission of Fine Arts. When we came to study the plan for the building itself we found:

First. That the triangle between Virginia Avenue and C Street was too small to permit adequate landscape treatment.

Second. That there was no room whatever for expansion, which will undoubtedly come within the next few years.

Third. That the Daughters of the American Revolution have recently built an auditorium which will make this particular area greatly congested.

The chief consideration, however, and the one that led the Commission of Fine Arts to suggest to the Pan American Union the use of the triangle between B Street and Virginia Avenue, as suggested in the joint resolution, was that it is contemplated to occupy the whole area between Seventeenth Street and Twenty-third Street with a series of buildings of the general character of the Corcoran Gallery, the Red Cross, the D. A. R. Building, and the Pan American Building; that is to say, comparatively small, low buildings, with ample space for gardens in front of them. The idea is to make a frame for the Lincoln Memorial. The type of building contemplated is shown in the National Academy of Sciences Building, which was designed as the first unit along B Street.

There are five possible units. The National Academy of Sciences Building is one. The American Pharmaceutical Association Building, to be built adjacent to it, a building designed in accordance with the idea above adverted to, is the second, the Pan American would be the third; leaving two squares to be taken care of in the future. One of these is already owned by the Government; the other is in private ownership, but at present is under control. This scheme provides a suitable termination for B Street, which is now being developed as the great monumental thoroughfare from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial. Changing the triangle to be occupied by the Pan American Annex will be to further the scheme and also to provide room for the expansion of the Pan American when necessary. When these considerations were taken up with Doctor Rowe he brought them to the attention of Secretary of State Kellogg and President Coolidge, and received from them their unqualified indorsement of the proposed change.

For the Commission of Fine Arts,  
Very respectfully yours,  
Charles Moore, Chairman.

EXHIBIT C



"As for authorizing the transfer for one year of the Pan American Union of an office building on the square of land lying between Washington, D.C. and Virginia Avenue, northwest, in the city of Washington. The plans for the said building to be moved to the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts. Approved May 16, 1928. (Public No. 404, 70th Congress, first session).

Senate Report No. 11, 71st Congress, 1st Session, approved May 16, 1928, as to the building in view of the transfer on the north side of Virginia Avenue, the triangle bounded on the north by Virginia Avenue, northwest, on the south by B Street, northwest, and on the west by Nineteenth Street, northwest. Approved May 16, 1928.

The following letter from the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts explains the reason for the change of location:  
The Commission of Fine Arts,  
Washington, May 11, 1928.

Dear Senator Keyser, Chairman,  
Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,  
United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

I am sorry to hear of your letter of May 7, I would say that the location proposed for the Pan American Annex, as authorized in the joint resolution (H.R. 11,000) is acceptable to the Commission of Fine Arts. When we were to study the plan for the building itself we found:

First, that the triangle between Virginia Avenue and B Street was too small to permit adequate landscape treatment.

Second, that there was no room whatever for a expansion, which will undoubtedly come within the next few years.

Third, that the location of the American Association Building, recently built in auditorium which will make this particular area greatly congested.

The chief consideration, however, and the one that led the Commission of Fine Arts to suggest to the Pan American Union the use of the triangle between B Street and Virginia Avenue, as suggested in the joint resolution, was that it

contemplated to occupy the whole area between Seventeenth Street and Twenty-third Street with a series of buildings of the general character of the

McCormick Gallery, the Red Cross, the D. A. R. Building, and the Pan American Building; that is to say, comparatively small, low buildings, with ample space

for gardens in front of them. The idea is to have a series of buildings for the Lincoln

Memorial. The type of building contemplated is shown in the National Academy of Sciences Building, which was designed as the first unit along B Street.

There are like possible units. The location of the American Association Building, to be built adjacent

to it, a building designed in accordance with the idea above suggested to be

in the future, the Pan American would be the third building in the series owned by the Government;

the other is in private ownership, but at present is under control. This scheme

provides a suitable location for the Pan American Annex will be to

changing the triangle to be occupied by the Pan American Annex will be to

further the scheme and also to provide room for the expansion of the Pan American

most necessary. When these considerations were taken up with Doctor Howe he

wrote them to the attention of Secretary of State Kellogg and President

McCalister, and received from them their unqualified indorsement of the proposed

For the Commission of Fine Arts,  
Very respectfully yours,  
Charles Moore, Chairman



March 22, 1948

Dear Mr. Clarke,

At their meeting on February 18, 1948, the Commission of Fine Arts designated the Chairman to represent the Commission on an inspection of certain proposed World War II Cemeteries in France during the month of April 1948, without expense to the Government of the United States.

Public Law 456 - 79th Congress, approved on June 26, 1946, (Chap. 502 - 2nd Session), provides (Sec. 3) "That before any design or material for memorials (to commemorate the services of the American Armed Forces) is accepted by the Commission (American Battle Monuments Commission) the same shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts."

It will be most helpful to this Commission if you will undertake to make an inspection of the sites of as many World War I and World War II cemeteries in France as you find time to visit.

Sincerely yours,

H. P. Caemmerer  
Secretary

Hon. Gilmore D. Clarke  
Chairman  
Commission of Fine Arts  
480 Park Avenue  
New York 22, New York

D







COPY

The Commission of Fine Arts

Washington

February 11, 1948.

The Zoning Commission  
District Building  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts desire to place themselves on record as heartily favoring the amendments which the Zoning Commission have proposed in connection with the rezoning of Old Georgetown in order to encourage the preservation of the historic residential character of this notable section of the National Capital.

Georgetown is unique in that it was a city of fully 5,000 when the plan for the City of Washington was adopted. There were many fine mansions and smaller residences in Georgetown at the end of the 18th Century and a considerable number of these historic monuments are still standing today, preserved in their original state of beauty and usefulness.

In 1933 the Commission of Fine Arts was called upon to advise in a program to restore certain of the old houses in Georgetown and in the subsequent years they have cooperated in this noteworthy movement. To allow commercial interests to invade "Historic Georgetown" would be deplorable. The residents of these old historic houses with their adjoining gardens have made substantial investments in order to preserve the charm and distinguished character of this section of the Capital; indeed it represents a movement as important in the preservation of our national heritage as the restoration of Williamsburg, Virginia or of Charleston in South Carolina.

With the approaching Sesquicentennial Celebration in the year 1950, this Commission have hope that "Historic Georgetown" could be made one of the principal features of this occasion, for Georgetown is as well known abroad as it is throughout the United States.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke  
Chairman

EXHIBIT E



The Commission of Fine Arts

Washington

February 11, 1935

The Acting Commission  
District Building  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts desires to place on record as having been the Commission of Fine Arts which the Commission have proposed in connection with the restoration of the Capitol in order to encourage the preservation of the historic part of the Capitol and the preservation of the national capital.

Georgetown is unique in that it was a city of fully 5,000 when the plan for the City of Washington was adopted. There were many fine mansions and smaller residences in Georgetown at the end of the 18th Century and a considerable number of these historic mansions are still standing today, preserved in their original state of beauty and usefulness.

In 1933 the Commission of Fine Arts was called upon to advise in a program to restore certain of the old houses in Georgetown and in the subsequent years they have cooperated in this historic worthy movement. To allow commercial interests to remove "historic Georgetown" would be a disaster. The residents of these old historic houses with their adjoining gardens have made substantial investments in order to preserve the charm and distinguished character of this section of the Capital; indeed it represents a movement as important in the preservation of our national heritage as the restoration of Williamsburg, Virginia or of Charleston in South Carolina.

With the approaching Bicentennial Celebration in the year 1976, this Commission has been asked "Historic Georgetown" could be made one of the principal features of this occasion, for Georgetown is as well known abroad as it is throughout the United States.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William D. Clark  
Chairman

ENCLOSURE



## Commission Rezones 16-Acre Georgetown Area as Residential

The Zoning Commission has rezoned as residential about 16 acres of Georgetown property, which had been classified as commercial for the last 28 years.

The commission said it had been advised the rezoning would increase the property values in the area. The area involved represents the largest rezoned since the end of the war.

The decision ends a long fight by residents of Georgetown to preserve the historical appearance and early architecture of many of the houses in that section of the city. In asking that the change be made, they told the commission at the hearing earlier this month that old Georgetown must be preserved as an historical and architectural "masterpiece."

### Feared Demolitions.

They said many of the residences in the area that had been zoned commercial might be demolished and commercial establishments erected, detracting from the Colonial appearance of many nearby homes.

The area rezoned is a doughnut-shaped section bounded by M street, Thirty-seventh street, P street and Wisconsin avenue. At the hearing held by the commission on February 11, the proposal was hotly contested on both sides. The interior portion of the area is zoned residential and will remain unchanged. The rim of the area, however, is rezoned to restrict it to single-family dwellings.

The new zoning regulation, however, will permit five-story apartments on Prospect avenue between Potomac and Thirty-seventh streets N.W.

### Original Plan Revised.

When the hearing was held, own-

ers holding 20 per cent of the total frontage opposed the change to residential, those with 38 per cent of the frontage said they were in favor of it and the remainder were silent. The commission's first proposal was to rezone 17 acres from commercial to residential, but it was finally decided on about 16 acres. Potomac street was left commercial on both sides of the street between M street and Prospect avenue N.W., and several lots on Thirty-fifth street and several lots on T and O streets, west Wisconsin avenue N.W., also were zoned commercial.

In announcing its decision yesterday, the commission said the revised decision was opposed by owners of only 9½ per cent of the frontage involved.

Those who appeared at the hearing to protect the rezoning told the commission the proposed change would cut property values in the area, reduce the municipal government revenues and discriminate unfairly against persons who had purchased the property with the intention of using it commercially.







COPY

The Commission of Fine Arts

Washington

February 19, 1948.

Honorable A. E. Demaray  
Associate Director  
National Park Service  
Department of the Interior  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Demaray:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 18, 1948, considered the design which you submitted for a memorial stone which the Knights of Pythias desire to place in the Washington Monument. The Commission disapprove the design.

The design and the accompanying correspondence are herewith returned.

It is suggested that this submission be referred to the Washington National Monument Society with a request for information regarding the policy they recommend in such matters. While the Commission of Fine Arts disapprove the design submitted, they would like to know whether or not the Society looks with favor upon the installation of memorial stones in the event that designs submitted should prove to be acceptable from an artistic viewpoint.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke  
Chairman

Exhibit G

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON

February 18, 1944

Honorable A. E. Demaree  
Associate Director  
National Park Service  
Department of the Interior  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Demaree:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 18, 1944, considered the design which was submitted for a memorial stone which the Knights of Pythias desire to place in the Washington Monument. The Commission disapprove the design.

The design and the accompanying correspondence are herewith returned.

It is suggested that this submission be referred to the Washington National Monument Society with a request for information regarding the policy they recommend in such matters. While the Commission of Fine Arts disapprove the design submitted, they would like to know whether or not the Society looks with favor upon the installation of memorial stones in the event that designs submitted should prove to be acceptable from an artistic viewpoint.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

Clifford D. Clark

Enclosure



COPY

The Commission of Fine Arts  
Washington

February 18, 1948.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

It has been a pleasure over a long period of years to have worked with your representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, in the development of the highest class and quality, from an artistic viewpoint, of medals and decorations.

Under the provisions of an Executive Order dated July 28, 1921, we are privileged in participating in the design and production of new medals and decorations, which are so important in morale, and in the commemoration of outstanding achievements of the armed forces.

Our relationship with Mr. Arthur E. DuBois, Director Heraldic Affairs, has always been pleasant and mutually advantageous. We would like to be of greater assistance in this work under the stated purpose of the recent unification bill, and to this end we wish to suggest that it would be in the interests of efficiency and good administration to establish a centralized office of the military establishment of the liaison on Heraldic matters with the Commission of Fine Arts. Because of his eminent qualifications, we respectfully recommend that you designate Mr. DuBois Director of Heraldic Affairs as your liaison and contact representative. It is believed that with this action the high quality of medals and decorations, and other items of Heraldic form, will be improved and maintained.

for the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,  
Chairman.

Hon. James Forrestal,  
Secretary of Defence,  
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT H

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
WASHINGTON

February 12, 1921.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

It has been a pleasure over a long period of years to have worked with your representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, in the development of the highest class and quality, from an artistic viewpoint, of medals and decorations.

Under the provisions of an Executive Order dated July 29, 1917, we are privileged in participating in the design and production of new medals and decorations, which are so important in morale, and in the commemoration of outstanding achievements of the great forces.

Our relationship with Mr. Arthur E. Woods, Director Heraldic

Affairs, has always been pleasant and mutually advantageous. As would like to see a greater assistance in this work under the stated purpose of the recent legislation bill, and to this end we wish to suggest that it would be in the interests of efficiency and good administration to establish a centralized office of the military establishment of the nation on certain matters with the Commission of Fine Arts. Because

of his eminent qualifications, we respectfully recommend that you designate Mr. Woods Director of Heraldic Affairs as your liaison and contact representative. It is believed that this action will result in the improvement of medals and decorations, and other items of heraldic form, will be

improved and maintained.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William L. Lincoln,  
Chairman.

Mr. James B. Connelley,  
Secretary of Defense,  
Washington, D. C.



## The Commission of Fine Arts

Washington

February 18, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Thomas North  
Secretary  
American Battle Monuments Commission  
Washington, D.C.

Dear General North:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 17, 1948, gave preliminary approval to second stage designs and models which you submitted in behalf of the American Battle Monuments Commission for World War II Cemeteries at:-

Anzio, Italy - Gugler, Kimball and Husted, Architects

Florence, Italy - McKim, Mead and White, Architects

Margraten, Holland - Coolidge, Shepley, Bulfinch and Abbott, -  
Architects (except as hereinafter noted).

Suresnes, France - William and Geoffrey Platt, Architects.

The Commission were pleased to discuss the designs and models, submitted by the several firms of architects, with you and with your Consulting Architect, Mr. Harbeson. They were gratified with the designs submitted for chapels and related architectural elements for the cemeteries at Anzio, Florence, and Suresnes. In each case the architects developed solutions to the specific problems which are in harmony with the surroundings, dignified, distinguished in character, and eminently suitable.

The Commission were especially pleased with the manner in which Messrs. William and Geoffrey Platt planned extensions to the World War I Chapel at Suresnes, designed by their distinguished father, Charles A. Platt.

It is understood that the architects for the cemeteries at Anzio, Florence, and Suresnes will submit more detailed plans from time to time as they are developed. It is important that sculptors and painters be brought into collaboration at an early a date as practicable.

EXHIBIT I





The Commission considered the designs for the chapel and other related architectural elements submitted for the cemetery at Margraten in Holland by Coolidge, Shepley, Bulfinch and Abbott. The Commission were pleased with the general arrangement of the areas around the chapel site, however, they believe that the design for the chapel itself should be given further study with a view toward simplification. The general scheme for the tower chapel is appealing and it is believed that, with further study, this idea may be developed into an outstanding architectural composition.

The designs for the chapel and incidental architectural elements submitted by Holabird and Root for the cemetery at Henryi Chapell in Belgium were not approved. The design lacks monumental quality, dignity, and those other characteristics indicative of an important memorial. The Commission would like to have this submission restudied with a view toward securing a solution which possesses those spiritual qualities so necessary in a monument erected to the honored dead of World War II.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke  
Chairman

The Commission considered the designs for the chapel and other related architectural elements submitted for the cemetery at Haverham in Holland by Coolidge, Shepley, Robinson and Johnson. The Commission was pleased with the general arrangement of the design around the chapel site, however, they believe that the design for the chapel itself should be given further study with a view toward simplification. The general scheme for the tower chapel is appealing and it is believed that, with further study, this idea may be developed into an outstanding architectural composition.

The designs for the chapel and incidental architectural elements submitted by Holabird and Root for the cemetery at Haverham in Holland were not approved. The design lacks monumental quality, dignity, and does not reflect the character of an important memorial. The Commission would like to have this suggestion restated with a view toward securing a solution which possesses those artistic qualities so necessary in a permanent structure for the honored dead of World War II.

For the Commission of the Area:

Sincerely yours,

William J. Glavin  
Chairman



## The Commission of Fine Arts

February 24, 1948.

Dear General North:

Upon careful consideration of this problem the Commission suggest that only one assignment be made to each artist. There are so many eminently qualified sculptors, mural painters, workers in stained glass and in mosaics that the Commission feel that it would be in the best interests of the work if the commissions to artists were limited to a single project.

[illegible]

( EXHIBIT J )

February 11, 1914

Wm. General Thomas

Secretary  
American Battle Monuments Commission  
Washington, D.C.

Dear General Thomas:

In their meeting on February 11th the Commission of Fine Arts considered the matter related to the appointment of the artist for the several works set in connection with the battle monuments, and other artists to be selected to collaborate on the design and the realization of the various and of the other related architectural elements.

Upon careful consideration of this problem the Commission suggest that only one assignment be made to each artist. There are so many eminently qualified sculptors, mural painters, workers in various fields and in various parts of the Commission feel that it would be in the best interests of the work of the Commission to assign were limited to a single project.

Accordingly, and in consideration of the proposed list of artists submitted by various of the architects, the Commission approve the following list of artists to work with the architects indicated:-

1. SURRENDER - Wm. & Geoffrey Platt ( Louis Blain s.
2. ANKIO - Gugler, Kimball & Husted ( Paul Manship s.  
( Barry Paulman p.
3. CAMBRIDGE - Perry, Shaw & Hepburn ( Joseph Collett s.  
( George Hemmings s.
4. DRAUGHTSMAN - Thomas & Husted ( Thomas Husted s.
- \*5. FLORENCE - McKim, Mead & White ( Sidney Waugh s.
6. MONUMENT - McKim, Mead & White ( Paul Manship s.  
( Barry Paulman p.
7. St. JAMES - Wm. T. Aldrich ( Lee Iawrie s.
8. PRIMAL - Delano & Aldrich ( John Gregory s.  
( George Hemmings p.



COPY

If the architects wish to make changes in the above list, after you have taken the matter up with them, there will be no objection to such action insofar as this Commission is concerned.

Washington

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

February 19, 1943.

Honorable W. E. Reynolds  
Commissioner  
Public Buildings Administration  
Federal Works Agency  
Washington, D. C.

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke  
Chairman

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 18, 1943, considered the designs and models which you submitted for \*P.S. Since dictating this letter Mr. Waugh telephoned to me and stated that he had discussed with Messrs. Platt and J.K. Smith concerning his preference and that it is agreeable to all that he work with McKim, Mead and White. that, as the plans are developed in greater detail, they will be referred to the Commission for their consideration and that the final plans subsequently will be submitted for approval.

At their next meeting the Commission will be pleased to review, with your representatives, the plans for the layout of the road system of the National Institute of Health.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke  
Chairman

EXHIBIT 1



If the architects wish to make changes in the above list, after you have taken the matter up with them, there will be no objection to such action insofar as this Commission is concerned.

Very Respectfully,  
For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Dear General Board:

At a meeting on February 14th, 1914, the Commission considered the matter referred to the Commission for the several works of art. It was decided that the other artists to be included in the list of the other works of art should be included.

Since dictating this letter Mr. Waugh telephoned to me and stated that he had discussed with Messrs. Platt and J.K. Smith concerning his preference and that it was his intention to all that he work with McKim, Mead and White, and in addition that the Commission should be in the best interests of the work of the Commission to artists were limited to a single project.

Accordingly, and in consideration of the program list of artists suggested by certain of the architects, the Commission approved the following list of artists to work with the architects as indicated:-

1. BURMAN - Mr. & Mrs. J. J. Burman
2. ARTHUR - Mr. & Mrs. J. J. Arthur
3. CAMPBELL - Mr. & Mrs. J. J. Campbell
4. BRADSHAW - Mr. & Mrs. J. J. Bradshaw
5. BROWN - Mr. & Mrs. J. J. Brown
6. BOWEN - Mr. & Mrs. J. J. Bowen
7. ST. JAMES - Mr. & Mrs. J. J. St. James
8. ERIK - Mr. & Mrs. J. J. Erik

( ENCLOSE )



COPY

The Commission of Fine Arts

Washington

February 19, 1948.

Honorable W. E. Reynolds  
Commissioner  
Public Buildings Administration  
Federal Works Agency  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 18, 1948, considered the designs and models which you submitted for the expansion of the National Institute of Health at Bethesda, Maryland. In particular the Commission considered the design for a hospital and research laboratory and gave general approval to the preliminary plans for this building at this particular stage of development. It is understood that, as the plans are developed in greater detail, they will be referred to the Commission for their consideration and that the final plans subsequently will be submitted for approval.

At their next meeting the Commission will be pleased to review, with your representatives, the plans for the layout of the road system of the National Institute of Health.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke  
Chairman

EXHIBIT K



COPY

It is requested that you make changes in the above list, after you have taken into consideration the Commission of Fine Arts will be no objection to such action insofar as this Commission is concerned.

Washington

February 19, 1948.

Honorable W. E. Reynolds

Commissioner

Public Buildings Administration

Federal Works Agency

Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 18, 1948, considered the designs and models which you submitted for the expansion of the National Institute of Health at Bethesda, Maryland. In particular the Commission considered the design for a hospital and research laboratory and gave general approval to the preliminary plans for this building at this particular stage of development. It is understood that, as the plans are developed in greater detail, they will be referred to the Commission for their consideration and that the final plans subsequently will be submitted for approval.

At their next meeting the Commission will be pleased to review, with your representatives, the plans for the layout of the road system of the National Institute of Health.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke  
Chairman

EXHIBIT K